

SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS Farmington Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary

Project:

South Davis County Transit DEIS

Meeting Purpose:

Farmington Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

Meeting

4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.
August 30, 2007

Location:

Farmington City Hall

Attendee

Angelo Papastamos
Kerry Doanne
Kim Clark
Jacqueline Jensen
Saffron Capson
Colleen Lavery
Jonathan Larsen
Elizabeth Angyal
Scott Blyze
Dave Peterson (representative)
Jared Hall
Ed Johnson
Scott Ogilvie
Sid Young
Gary Payne

Representing

UDOT
UTA
VIA
H.W. Lochner
H.W. Lochner
Carter & Burgess
Fehr & Peers
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member
Sub-Committee member

Meeting Summary:**Process**

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

Regional Workshop Recap

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the “universe of alternatives” entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study’s preliminary “long list alignments.” K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

Modes

Next, a “universe of modes” list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary “long list of modes” was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a “dot game” exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the Farmington sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

Category	Factors	Number of Dots
Market	Local trips are important.	3
	Commuter trips are important.	3
Capacity		0
Operating Characteristics	It should stop frequently.	0
	It should stop less frequently, and go faster.	2
Costs		2
Environmental/Community Considerations	It needs to sit within the context of my community.	2
	It needs to allow for good traffic flow.	6
Access	It needs to be easy to board.	.5
	I need to be able to get to it easily by auto, bike, or walk.	5.5

Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the “pros” and “cons” of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by Farmington sub-committee members.

BUS (1 Dot)	
Pro	Con
Bus on 200 East (SR-106) would not detract from the character of the community	Reliability – time waiting at stops
Cost	Number of bike racks
Access	Time consuming for riders
Stops frequently	Noise

BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (1 Dot)	
Pro	Con
Cost	Noise
Quicker option to get somewhere	Could have problem with number of bike racks
Accessible if located on Frontage Road (will connect to major shopping areas)	
Can be upgraded for improved service easily (e.g. there are varying levels of BRT)	

LRT – Light Rail Transit (3 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Safer during bad weather/snow	Cost – not as affordable as other options
More room for bicycles on LRT compared to bus	
Faster because it doesn't share right-of-way with vehicles	
Accessible if located on Frontage Road (will connect to major shopping areas)	
Noise – quieter than BRT	

Streetcar (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Safer during bad weather/snow	Less capacity compared to LRT
Fits with community context	Slower than LRT
"Cool"	

DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Takes advantage of existing infrastructure	With limited stops, is DMU effective?
Limited right-of-way acquisition	Doesn't serve east side
	"Ugly"

Notes: The Farmington sub-committee noted any rail alternative would have a fixed station, which would be both a pro (constant – encourages land use investment) and a con (not flexible with changes to community.)

Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 25th from 3:00-5:00 p.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, Farmington Sub-Committee Members